Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

VI. — *The Latin Monosyllables in their Relation to Accent and Quantity. A Study in the Verse of Terence.*[1]

By Prof. ROBERT S. RADFORD,

ELMIRA COLLEGE.

I. Problem and Method.

It is the purpose of this paper to investigate the cause of the syllable-shortening which occurs after short monosyllables in early Latin verse, and also in a more general way the part which monosyllabic words play in the accentuation of the Latin sentence. The data illustrating the quantitative and accentual relations of monosyllabic words will be drawn almost entirely from the six plays of Terence, although similar results have been obtained by the writer from an examination of ten of the plays of Plautus. In a study which involves the Latin sentence-accentuation it is scarcely necessary to state that the writer is greatly indebted to the brilliant labors in this field of Ritschl,[2] Klotz, Lindsay, Skutsch, Wackernagel, and many others, not to mention the detailed investigations of Ahlberg, Podiaski, Kämpf, and O. Brugman. Special indebtedness will be acknowledged in each case, but it will be readily understood that my total indebtedness to these scholars is greater than can be indicated in single references.

The two most frequent forms of syllable-shortening in early Latin occur in iambic words and in words preceded by a short monosyllable. In the case of iambic words the shortening is

[1] A paper treating the same subject in relation to the verse of Plautus was read by the writer before the Johns Hopkins Philological Association, April 24, 1903. An abstract of this paper has already been published in the *Johns Hopkins University Circulars*, Vol. XXIII, and the paper will appear in full in an early number of the *American Journal of Philology*.

[2] I think it proper, however, to state that at the time when I reached the main conclusions of this article I was not acquainted with that part of Ritschl's *Prolegomena* which treats the same subject, nor with Wackernagel's article in *Indogerm. Forsch.*, Vol. I.

now very generally attributed to the word-accent upon the initial syllable; a slight modification of this view would be to hold that the shortening is due to the analogy of pyrrhic words such as *erus* and *agit*, in which the quantitative relations do not retard the development of a clear stress-accent. A second and still larger class of shortened quantities arises when a short monosyllable, or dissyllable which has become a monosyllable by elision, precedes another word, as *sed abstulisti*, *sed argenti*. What is the cause of this shortening? Why is it that the short monosyllable has the power of shortening a following long syllable? Upon this question students of early Latin verse are far, I think, from having reached an agreement. It happens, necessarily, from the very structure of iambic verse, that a long syllable shortened in an iambic sequence is in every case either preceded or followed by the verse-accent; upon this coincidence rests the older view, still held by Seyffert, Leo, and Brix-Niemeyer, of an artificial[1] shortening produced by the verse-accent. Accentual scholars are themselves greatly divided in opinion at this point, and it does not seem necessary to mention all the theories which have been proposed, that of Klotz being especially difficult of acceptance, at least in the extreme form in which it is stated, *Grundzüge*, p. 68 ff., p. 45 ff. Ahlberg (*De corrept. iamb. Plaut. quaestiones*, Lund, 1901, p. 52 ff.), and Lindsay (*The Captivi*, London, 1900, p. 35[2]), have, it is true, clearly put forward the view that some form of word-grouping has taken place, and that the group-accent has in some way come

[1] The use of this term must not be understood as implying that I question in anapaestic verse or even occasionally in the beginning of a verse or colon of iambic or trochaic verse the occurrence of an "artificial" or metrical shortening produced by the very concrete, the very real verse-accent. If the cases of *séd-illum*, *sed-illúm* were only a few in number, I should be ready to accept the metrical explanation, to which I have no theoretical objections. But since these cases are very numerous, and since we know from many ancient testimonies that it is the *special* characteristic of Latin iambic verse to reproduce the cadence of colloquial speech, and thus to bring the verse-accent (as a subordinate factor) into coöperation with the word-accent, the metrical explanation appears to me untenable for iambic verse as a whole.

[2] In his earlier writings (*e.g. Lat. Lang.*, p. 202), Professor Lindsay hesitated between this view and the explanation given by Klotz, *Grundz.*, p. 68 ff.

into play, but neither of these scholars has undertaken to explain how the primary or secondary accent has come to rest upon the atonic monosyllable in a group like *sed ílle, sed àbstulísti.* So far as regards the word-grouping, Havet also long ago pointed out that *sed-abstulisti* forms to a certain extent 'one body' (see the quotation of his views in Plessis, *ed. Adelphoe*, p. 5), and in his *Métrique* (*e.g.* §§ 353, 363) he regularly links the monosyllables by a hyphen with the following word to indicate their proclitic character, but the particular explanation which he gives of the shortening in this group is so intimately connected with his theory of 'initial intensity' that it does not call for further notice here; on the theory of 'initial intensity' I shall make some observations in a later section of this article (see p. 95, below).

I wish to bring forward for the solution of this problem a method which as a whole has been hitherto untried. I propose in brief that for the moment we shall wholly dismiss the question of syllable shortening, shall observe the short monosyllables when they precede not long but short initial syllables, and determine independently the place of both the primary and the secondary grammatical accent in the groups thus formed. This means that we shall first determine the place of the primary accent in the groups *sed hic* (dissyllabic group), *sed agit* (trisyllabic group), *sed homines* (quadrisyllabic group), and the place of the secondary accent in the similar groups *sed amore, sed amaverunt, sed hilaritudo.* It is not possible, to be sure, to determine directly the place of the accent in all these groups, nor is it necessary. A single group, the trisyllabic, offers exceptional opportunities for the determination of its accent, and affords the one point where an accent-law may be established, capable of extension in principle to all the groups.

A trisyllabic group of this type (⏑, ⏑ ⏒) may assume two forms; it may either form an anapaest, *sed agunt*, or a tribrach, *sed agit.* Now from the first of these forms, the anapaestic, we can derive no aid; for, owing to the structure of iambic verse, the group can never occur without receiving the verse-accent either upon the initial syllable, *séd agunt* (much the

more frequent form), or upon the ultimate *sed agúnt* (less frequent form). Hence in this case we can draw no conclusions as to the natural accent.

But with the second form of the trisyllabic group, viz., the tribrach form, *sed agit*, the case is wholly different; for so far as concerns the structure of iambic verse, the group is perfectly flexible and may receive the ictus equally well and with nearly equal frequency either upon the initial syllable, *séd agit*, or upon the second syllable, *sed ágit*. So far, however, as concerns the word-grouping, the group must not admit the ictus upon the second syllable, if in consequence of peculiarly close grouping it has acquired the grammatical accent of a single tribrach word, *i.e.* the grammatical accent, *séd agit*, belonging to an improvised compound (as we may say), just as the accent *ineo* belongs to a permanent compound. For it is a well-known rule of Latin iambic verse that a tribrach word receives the metrical accent in general only upon the initial syllable and thus almost always in agreement with the grammatical accent, *i.e.* regularly *génere*, very rarely *genére*.

Before we proceed to apply the test just indicated to the verse of Terence, it will be necessary to comment briefly upon the general character of the Latin monosyllables. According to an oft-repeated rule of the grammarians the monosyllables are usually without the accent.[1] Thus Priscian (Keil, *G. L.* III, p. 479, 20 = Schöll, *De accentu linguae lat.*, p. 194) in speaking of the accent of *iam* (in *iam dudum*) says: Gravem, ut omnia fere monosyllaba praepositiva; see also *ibid.*, p. 478, 22 (accent of *at*); p. 24, 21, etc. This rule does not apply of course to monosyllabic nouns and verbs, as many other testimonies of the grammarians show (cf. Schöll, *De acc.*, p. 108 f.), but only to those words which, owing to their meaning, are naturally unaccented in many languages, viz., the monosyllabic prepositions, conjunctions, pronouns, and adverbs (see, *e.g.*, Wallin, *Yale Psychol. Lab. Studies*, IX, p. 21 f.; Meyer-Lübke, *Gramm. d. roman. Spr.*, I, p. 503;

[1] L. Müller reaches the same conclusion on metrical grounds, *Res Metrica*[2], p. 467.

G. Paris, *Rôle de l'accent lat.*, p. 19). Hence there seems no good reason for doubting the substantial truth of the grammarians' rule, which means no more than the similar rule respecting the accent of prepositions, *i.e.* the prepositions — both *praepositiones compositae* and *adpositae* — are unaccented in a considerable majority of the cases in which they occur, as *confero*, *conferre*, *in navem*, *ex bello*. Besides, as will be shown later, the grammarians often distinctly recognize that the monosyllables may acquire an accent when they form part of a *compositum* or word-group. Thus it is evident from the grammarians' statements that the monosyllabic conjunctions, pronouns, and adverbs bear precisely the same relation to the accent as the monosyllabic prepositions. This conclusion is expressly confirmed by Audax (Keil, VII, p. 360, 1 ff.[1]), to whom we owe the clearest account of the accent of these particles that is to be found in Latin literature subsequent to Quintilian: non omnes partes orationis aequales sunt . . . nam et pronomen subiacet nomini, et verbo servit adverbium . coniunctio quoque et praepositio ad clientelam maiorum partium pertinent . hae ergo partes, quae adpendices sunt, sic maioribus copulantur, *ut tanquam in unam partem orationis*[2] *coalescant*, proprium vero fastigium perdant, non omnes dumtaxat, sed pleraeque.

It is necessary also to review briefly the treatment in iambic verse both of primary and of secondary word-accents belonging to the syllable-group, ⏑ ⏑ ⏒:

A. Primary Accentuation. — To determine with precision the place of the primary grammatical accent in trisyllabic groups of the form ⏑, ⏑ ⏒ is possible only through the fact that tribrach words such as *genere* do not as a rule admit the metrical accent upon the second syllable. Yet the statement sometimes made that Latin tribrach words never under any conditions admit the accent *genére* in iambic verse is not

[1] This is substantially the same as the anonymous quotation in Schöll, *De acc.*, p. 175 f., entitled "*Interr. et resp.*" which, however, is not placed, as might be expected, in the chapter on the accent of conjunctions.

[2] '*Una pars orationis*' is the special term which the grammarians employ of the *composita*, which, like *huiuscé modi*, *istiús modi*, etc., are known to be such through the test of the accentuation; cf. Schöll, *De acc.*, p. 124 ff.

altogether accurate, so far at least as regards the first foot of a verse or colon; and since we can scarcely expect that tribrach groups shall be treated more rigorously in this respect than tribrach words, it is important to state the usage of the iambic poets in respect to the first foot somewhat more fully than is done by Klotz, *Grundz.*, p. 274 ff., or by Ritschl, *Proleg.*, p. ccxxv ff. The evidence is conclusive that the Roman poets have sometimes admitted in tribrach words and in words ending in a tribrach the accentuation *genére* in the first foot of a verse or colon, although far more rarely and with much greater hesitation than they have admitted the accentuation *pectóre* in the same place. The usage of the later poets may be found in L. Müller, *Res Metr.*, p. 168: Seneca and Prudentius have each one such accentuation of the tribrach in the first foot (*fŭgímus*, *genére*), not to mention the more frequent cases in less careful writers such as Ausonius, Avienus, Terentianus, etc. From the Christian poets also some examples have been collected by Hümer, *Lateinisch-Christlichen Rhythmen*, p. 27. Examples from the metrical inscriptions are given by Hodgman, *Harvard Studies*, IX, p. 139, *i.e. CLE.* 67, 3 *itáque*; 92, 3 *Stephánē*; 211, 3 *nimía*. Ahlberg (*De proceleusmaticis antiquae poesis lat.*, Lund, 1900, I, p. 32) accepts the accentuations *sequimínei Merc.* 782, *muliéris* (first foot of second colon) *Most.* 169, *Minerúa*, *Bacch.* 893. Hence, even in cases where a correction would involve little textual change, it appears unnecessary to follow Langen (*Philologus*, XXXI, p. 109), and recent editors in emending *Mil.* 1120 *itáne* (Götz and Leo: *itan*), *Andr.* 478 *hĭcíne* (Umpf.: *hic inparatum*), Caecil. *com. frgm.* 232 *egóne* (retained by Ribbeck[3]), or to adopt with Schöll a change of order in *Cas.* 564: *homínem amatórem* (cf. Humphreys, *Trans. Am. Phil. Assoc.* VII (1876), p. 132 f.).[1] Examples in other feet than the first, however, are so rare in the republican and early imperial poetry that they must be regarded with extreme suspicion and are commonly removed from the text by transpo-

[1] Add also *hĭcine*, *Most.* 507; *egóne*, *Curc.* 119 (in cretic verse; Götz, *egon*); *reprime*, Acc. *trag. frgm.* 381.

sitions, yet it is important to recognize that a few such cases occur in our Mss. in texts otherwise free from suspicion, *i.e.* *Most.* 1100 *serére*, *Men.* 877 *valídus*, *Andr.* 596 *corrigére*, Sen. *Med.* 267 *feminéă*; see also Klotz, *Grundz.*, p. 274. Quite similar to the treatment of tribrach words is the treatment in iambic verse of the compound phrases (which are often written as one word) ending in a tribrach or an anapaest, such as *adeo*, *inibi*, *veluti*, *interibi*, *intereā*, *intereos*, *proptereā*, *propterea*, etc. According to the ancient orthography these phrases may equally well be written separately, *i.e. in ibi*, *ad eo*, *inter ibi*, *inter eā*, etc. (see, *e.g.*, CIL. I, *ind.* p. 609), but so far as concerns the accentuation, they apparently never admit of separation into their component parts (decomposition), but always receive the metrical accent upon the antepenult, *i.e. ín ibi*, *ád eo*, *intér ibi*, *intér eos*.

B. Secondary Accentuation. — I have so far discussed only cases of the primary accent in tribrach words, and students of Latin verse-accentuation have generally been content to confine their treatment to these cases. Of almost equal importance, however, are the cases of tribrach sequences which involve the secondary accent, that is, in which the syllables immediately preceding the primary accent form a tribrach series, as *càlămĭtátem*, *mìsĕrĭárum*, *fămĭlĭárem*, *hìlărĭtúdo*, etc. I have not been able to find in current discussions of Latin verse-accentuation any treatment of cases of this sort except a brief reference to somewhat similar cases in an article by Lindsay, *Philol.*, LI (1892), p. 373 (footnote). In point of fact the secondary accent in *càlamitátem* is observed almost as strictly by the Roman dramatists as the primary accent in *génere*. Of the nearly 200 cases of this kind occurring in Plautus, the secondary accent appears to be disregarded in only two or three, *e.g.* in the iambic verse-close of *Mil.* 562 *mălĭtĭosé tamén* and in the bacchiac verse-opening of *Cist.* 3 *ăpĕrŭistis*. [With respect to the latter case it is possible, but not especially likely, that the Latin bacchius admits the accentuation ∪ ⏑ ⏓ instead of the usual ∪ ⏑ –; cf. Christ, *Metr.*, p. 419 f.] Terence has apparently violated

the secondary tribrach accent twice, once in the middle of the verse, once in the verse-close: *Andr.* 941 *cum tuá rĕlĭgĭone ódium; Heaut.* 906 *ŏpĕrŭere óstiúm.* In both these cases other scansions than those which I have adopted are possible, *i.e. rēligione, opéruĕre*, but not especially probable (cf. Hauler, *Einl. Phorm.*, p. 54[3]). The elision of the final syllable in both cases prevents a double conflict and apparently renders the single conflict somewhat less harsh, but is far from producing a recession of the accent, *i.e. relígion(e)*, as has sometimes been supposed. It must be added that editors of Terence have not always sufficiently regarded this secondary accent in their conjectures; thus the reading *facílitat(em)* has been adopted by all recent editors except Umpfenbach in *Andr.* 232 instead of the Ms. *facúltatem*, but is wholly inadmissible in view of the unusual conflict, and the same is true of Fleckeisen's conjecture *cupíditat(e)*, *Heaut.* 208. Finally, this accentuation occurs once in the first foot of Saturnian verse, if the quantitative view of the Saturnian be correct, *i.e. Naev.* 109 (Havet) *Sicíliensés pacíscit.*

We may sum up the conclusions which we have reached as follows: In words and compound phrases forming a tribrach such as *genere, inibi* (*in ibi*), etc., the grammatical accent is in rare instances disregarded in the first foot of a verse or colon; there are also a very few cases, chiefly in the first foot or the verse-close, of the disregard of a secondary tribrach accent in words like *călămĭtátem.* It is evident that in any tribrach word-groups which we may discover to exist the same licenses will be admitted. It only remains to note briefly that the treatment of syllable-groups forming a dactyl (_ ∪ ∪) is considerably less strict; that in dactylic words such as *pectore* a primary grammatical accent is rather freely disregarded in the first foot and occasionally disregarded in the other feet (cf. Klotz, *Grundz.*, p. 274 ff.); further, that a secondary dactylic accent, such as that of *cŏmmŏdĭtátes*, was rather freely disregarded by the Roman iambic poets prior to the time of Phaedrus[1] in their strenuous endeavors to form

[1] Phaedrus has avoided these accentuations almost entirely; compare, however, in the verse-close *App.* 21, 12: *detinuisti pedés.*

legitimate iambic and trochaic verse-closes — thus in the verse-close, with harsh double-conflict: *Andr.* 569 at sí corrígitur, quót *commóditatés* vidé; *Phorm.* 843; cf. 284; cf. 676; *Hec.* 122; *Ad.* 880; Pacuv. *trag. frgm.* 164 R.; *id. inc.* LIV R., etc. — also occasionally in middle of verse, with elision of final syllable, *i.e.* with single conflict: *Andr.* 844; *Hec.* 797; Laber. *com. frgm.* 113 R.; Afran. *com. frgm.* 7, etc.; finally, we may note that dactylic compound phrases such as *attamen*, *quomodo*, *nescio*, and *obviam* admit to a certain extent — most often in the first foot — of being treated as two words through decomposition, *i.e. at támen*, *quo módo*, *ne scío*, *ob víam* (cf. Klotz, *Grundz.*, p. 276; Ritschl, *Proleg.*, p. ccxxxvii; Skutsch, *Forsch.*, p. 158). The reason for the difference of treatment in the verse-accentuation of tribrach and dactylic words need not be discussed here (compare, however, Klotz, *Grundz.*, p. 278 f.); I shall only remark in conclusion that, owing to the decomposition (recomposition) which is admitted even in the most frequently occurring dactylic *composita*, it is not possible for us to employ as rigorous tests for the determination of the regular accent of dactylic groups (_, ∪ ∪) as can be employed in the case of tribrach groups (∪, ∪ ∪).

II. Comparison with Greek Verse.

It is evident that if, in pursuing this investigation, we shall find the Latin tribrach group accented either wholly or in very large part upon the initial syllable, *i.e. séd agit*, the question will still present itself, whether, after all, there is not some reason in the special kind of iambic or trochaic verse, some reason in the placing of the caesurae for the non-occurrence of the accentuation *sed-ágit*. With this question in view, I have examined about 1500 Greek iambic and trochaic verses in Philemon and Aristophanes, and I find that in Greek, where the influence of the stress-accent does not exist, the two accentuations occur with equal frequency in trochaic verse and in the longer iambic verses, in 500 verses of this sort the metrical accent falling 9 times upon the sec-

ond syllable and an equal number of times upon the initial syllable, while in the iambic trimeter the accent upon the second syllable bears to the initial accent the ratio approximately of 2 : 3.[1] Thus the trimeter alone is found to be somewhat more favorable in its structure to the initial accent for the reason that of its two chief caesurae the *semiquinaria* is more frequent than the *semiseptenaria*. The two most common forms of a Greek trimeter containing one of these trisyllabic groups may be seen from the following verses:

Phil. *frgm.* 90, 1 (Kock): μείζω τὰ κακὰ ποιοῦσι | πολλοί, δέσποτα.
2

Id. *frgm.* 90, 6 τοσοῦτο γέγονε | τὸ κακὸν ἡλίκον περ ἦν.
3

The results obtained through an examination of Greek verse may be stated in detail as follows: In more than 600 iambic trimeters of Philemon the ratio of the medial to the initial accent is 12 : 19; the medial accent occurs in *frgmm.* 31, 5; 44, 4; 60, 2; 79, 11; 88, 9; 89, 1; 90, 1; 90, 11; 98, 1; 131; 207; 240. In 450 trimeters of Aristophanes's *Equites* (extending through v. 1025) the ratio is 5 : 8; the medial accent occurs in *Eq.* 124; 140; 202; 482; 938. In 150 iambic tetrameters of Aristophanes the ratio is 4 : 4; the medial accent occurs *Eq.* 338; 433; 859; 899. In 350 trochaic tetrameters and dimeters of Aristophanes (*Nub.*, *Eq.*, *Ran.*, *Av.*) the ratio is 5 : 5; the medial accent occurs *Eq.* 280; *Av.* 280; 388; 396; 790. In the 1500 verses examined the medial accent occurs 26 times, the initial accent 36 times. In making the count cases of the secondary accent, such as Phil. *frgm.* 100, 2, τίς ἐλάλησεν, were estimated according to the Latin accent-law. A distinction was also made between real and apparent trisyllabic groups, *e.g.* in Phil. *frgm.* 7, 1 γὰρ ἐπὶ τὸ ῥῆμ', the preposition ἐπὶ is, of course, proclitic, and the first part of the resulting group, γὰρ ἐπὶ-τὸ ῥῆμα, is not trisyllabic but quadrisyllabic. We may conclude, I think, from these statistics that in respect to the placing of the metrical accent upon the first or the second syllable of such

[1] This ratio will hold good approximately for all the trimeters of the Middle and New Comedy according to the references given by Perschinka, *De med. et nov. com. trim. iamb.*, *Dissert. Philol. Vindob.* III, 330 ff.

phrases as *μὰ Δία, πρὸς ἐμέ, τὰ κακά* the Greek is absolutely indifferent, as it is upon the whole indifferent in the accentuation of the tribrach word.[1]

III. Summary of Terentian Usage.

The same test yields very different results when applied to the Latin poets. The accentuation of all the tribrach groups occurring in Terence is given in detail in a later section of this paper (p. 78 ff.), but since I wish, before proceeding farther, to discuss the origin and the effects of this accentuation, I shall here briefly summarize the results obtained in the fuller discussion. There are in Terence 176 certain or highly probable cases of tribrach (trisyllabic) groups of the form ⏑, ⏑ ⏑ which show the initial accent, 3 certain cases of tribrach groups which show the medial accent, and half a dozen cases in which the accentuation is ambiguous (see p. 82 f., p. 85). We may estimate the ratio of the initial to the medial accent to be about 40: 1, and we shall be justified in concluding that the former accentuation alone has been known to the spoken language of the republican period. With quadrisyllabic groups of the form ⏑, ⏑ ⏑ ⏒ the case is somewhat different; in these groups the accent has vacillated in the republican period between the first and the second syllables. Yet since the recessive force of the accent is seen to be much less in quadrisyllabic words, which are accented either *géneribus* or *genéribus*,[2] than in trisyllabic words, which are accented only *génere*, and since consequently the force of the recession is insufficient to overcome entirely the slight pause which falls between the monosyllable and the following word,

[1] According to F. Hanssen, "Ueber den griech. Wortictus," *Rhein. Mus.* XXXVII (1882), p. 258 ff. (cf. also Havet, *Cours élém. de métr.*, p. 116 f.) Greek tragedy is not wholly indifferent in tribrach words; on the other hand, Greek comedy is altogether indifferent, according to Humphreys, *Trans. Am. Phil. Assoc.* VII (1876), p. 133; Klotz, *Grundz.*, p. 269 f.; Perschinka, *l.l.*, p. 330 ff.

[2] According to the valuable data furnished by Professor Humphreys, who, after a comparison of Greek usage, has made the necessary corrections for the influence of the verse-form (*Trans. Am. Phil. Assoc.* VII, p. 137), the accent *géneribus* has been from three to five times as frequent in the actual speech of the republican period as the accent *genéribus*.

the more usual accentuation of the quadrisyllabic groups has been that of the second syllable, *i.e. sed hómines*, although the initial accent, *séd homines*, appears also to have been in current use.

It is chiefly through the tendency of the monosyllables to coalesce in pronunciation with the following word that trisyllabic groups have been formed in Latin and have received re-accentuation in accordance with the three-syllable or the earlier initial accent law. As has already been indicated, the pause that divides a word of one or two *morae* from the following word may be shown by numerous metrical tests to be extremely brief in a quantitative language like the Latin; yet, even with the diminishing pause, a recession of the accent cannot easily arise without a fixed or usual order of words. Hence, if, as appears to be the case, a general recession of the accent has taken place in these groups, this must be due to the analogy of the many phrases which have acquired a fixed order. We may suppose that the analogy of the numerous verbal compounds with monosyllabic prepositions, such as *abeo*, *ineo*, *pereo*, *subeo*, has first exerted its influence and led to the recession of the accent in all the trisyllabic locutions of fixed form or frequent occurrence. The latter, the fixed locutions, are indeed very numerous; thus with *enim* alone we have *et enim*, *at enim*, *sed enim*, *neque enim*, *quid enim*, *quod enim*, *quia enim*, *ego enim*, etc., all of which are virtual *composita* and in very frequent use. Again, in consequence of the rules of word-position by which the personal and demonstrative pronouns are attached in the sentence directly to prepositive conjunctions, to interrogative words and affirmative particles, a multitude of fixed locutions arise containing *ego* and the various forms of *is; i.e. et ego* (Seyffert, *Stud. Plaut.*, p. 12), *nam ego* (*ibid.*, p. 20), *pol ego* (Kellerhoff, *Studem. Stud.*, II, p. 60 ff.), *quid ego* (Kämpf, *Pronom. Personal.*, p. 31 f.), *quod ego* (*ibid.*, p. 33), *at ego*, *sed ego*, *dum ego*, *ubi ego*, etc.; *at ea*, *et ea*, *sed eum*, *at eum ad eum*, *in eum*, *ab eo*, *quid eo*, etc.; with *homo* also we have the frequent phrases *hic homo*, *is homo*, *quis homo*, *qui homo*, etc. In short, of the 180 cases of the tribrach group found

in Terence, nearly two-thirds occur apparently in fixed locutions of this character. Finally, the analogy of the fixed locutions is followed by the merely fugitive and infrequent combinations, *i.e.* the analogy of *quíd agit* and *ídagit* is followed by *séd agit*, and the accentual group in its developed form does not apparently require the closest possible connection in sense, provided always that the single words involved belong to the same clause. Thus we have not only the frequent phrases *quíd ais* and *tú ais*, but also *Phorm.* 380 quem amícum *túom ais* fuísse, and not only the frequent phrase *úbi erit*, but also *Hec.* 474 *méo erit* íngenió.

Lindsay (*Lat. Lang.*, p. 167 ff., and *Journal of Philology*, XX, 150 ff.) and Skutsch (*Forsch.*, p. 157 ff.), in treating the sentence-accentuation in Plautus and Terence, have already discussed at length the proclisis of the Latin prepositions, but they have overlooked the similar proclisis [1] of the monosyllabic conjunctions and adverbs. Yet the proclitic character of the Latin monosyllables, as a class, has always been recognized in a general way by Latin metricians, and has often been invoked in the explanation of special rules of Latin prosody; see L. Müller, *Res Metr.*[2], pp. 164–170, 460–467; Ritschl, *Proleg.*, pp. ccxiii, ccxxxiii, etc.; Podiaski, *Quomodo Terentius in tetrametris iambicis et trochaicis*, etc., pp. 7, 10, etc.; O. Brugman, *Quemadmodum in iambico senario*, etc., p. 18; Köhler, *De verb. acc. in troch. sept. Plaut.*, p. 29; cf. Weil et Benloew, *L'Accentuation lat.*, p. 56, and Corssen, *Ausspr.*, II[2], 862 ff. The Roman grammarians also recognize no distinction in character between the prepositions and other monosyllabic words, as the testimony of Audax, quoted above (p. 64), clearly shows. Finally, the Latin iambic poets of the classical period, when admitting a short monosyllable to form part of the resolved arsis,[2] treat the

[1] I do not forget in making this statement that many German scholars employ 'enclisis' as a general term for word-grouping (Tonanschluss), and avoid entirely the use of the term 'proclisis,' which, as is well known, is not of ancient origin, but a coinage of G. Hermann's. On my own account I have not hesitated to employ 'proclisis,' after observing the general use of the term among Romance scholars.

[2] By 'arsis' is meant the strong, or accented part of the foot.

prepositions and conjunctions precisely alike; *i.e.* they use *ĭn-ămore* and *ĕt-ămore*, with equal frequency, as quasi-quadrisyllabic words; for examples, see B. Schmidt, *De Senecae tragg. rationibus prosodiacis et metricis*, p. 46 f.

In saying that the Latin monosyllables are regularly proclitic, I do not mean to deny that there are many single phrases in which monosyllabic words have acquired an enclitic use through the observance of some fixed order. Such phrases are *nescio quis* (*nescioquis*), *nisi si* (*nisisi*), *simul ac* (*simulac*), *etiam nunc* (*etiamnunc*), and the like, a fuller enumeration of which may be found in Corssen, *Ausspr.*, II^2, 835–861. Especially frequent in these phrases is the quantitative type ⏑ ⏑, ⏒, which, by an extension of usage, seems sometimes to be pronounced as a single word in the caesurae of the chief Latin verses, on the basis of the form alone. Important as these enclitic phrases are, they constitute a very small part of the total use of monosyllabic words. The parts of the substantive verb are also regularly enclitic; compare the frequent writing *amatast*, *amatumst* in our Mss. Hence, it is necessary to distinguish carefully between the groups *quid opus* alone and *quid opus-est*. The first is trisyllabic (*quíd opus*); the second is quadrisyllabic, and has a variable accent (*quíd opus-est* or *quid ópus-est*), just as we have found the accent to vary in *quid agitur* and *sed homines*. The case is similar with *et ego* or *at ita* alone, and the fuller combinations *et ego-me* or *at ita-me*.

According to the view here adopted, trisyllabic groups, such as *sed enim*, *sed ego*, *sed homo*, etc., have originally arisen through the proclisis of the monosyllable, but with the result that a dissyllable with short penult has practically become enclitic whenever a monosyllable precedes. This explanation may appear at first to be somewhat at variance with the results reached by Wackernagel in his extremely valuable and comprehensive article, "Ueber ein Gesetz der Indogermanischen Wortstellung," *Indogerman. Forsch.*, I (1891), p. 333 ff. In the part of this article devoted to the Latin word-order (p. 406 ff.[1]), Wackernagel has shown, with

[1] See, also, the summary in Stolz, *Histor. Gramm. d. lat. Spr.*, I, p. 105.

great completeness, that the Latin personal and demonstrative pronouns manifest a strong tendency to occupy the second place in the sentence, — a place which is not only commonly occupied, in Latin, by such unemphatic words as *enim*, *quidem*, etc., but which is associated, in most of the Indo-European languages, with accentual weakness, or enclisis. It follows that the personal and demonstrative pronouns are enclitic whenever they follow the prepositive conjunctions, as well as in some other cases. While it did not fall within the scope of his article to treat the verse-accent of the early Latin poets, Wackernagel has clearly demonstrated, in substance, that at some period of the Latin language the initial accent existed in many of the groups which we are now discussing, viz. *séd ego*, *séd eum*, *quíd eo*, etc., as well as *séd tu*, *séd mihi*, and the like. I gladly recognize the great value of Wackernagel's independent proof of the fact, but in respect to the process, although he has found it convenient to employ the term 'enclisis' throughout, I cannot see that his results are necessarily opposed to the account which I have just given. In the first place, in a very large number of the trisyllabic groups which we are now discussing, the weakly accented word does not, as a rule, occupy the second position in the sentence, *i.e. ád eum*, *ád erum*, *tíbi ego*, *sát erat*, *túm agam*, *híc homo*, etc., so that no theory of enclisis will apply to these cases. Secondly, the personal and demonstrative pronouns, being usually employed without emphasis, are more or less weakly accented in all parts of the sentence; hence they naturally gravitate to the second, or enclitic position, which is, however, rather to be considered a proof than a cause of their weakness. In view of these considerations it seems probable that the initial accent has arisen in the manner already described, although it is not to be denied that in some cases word-grouping through enclisis may also have operated, and the two processes may have gone on side by side.

In any case the results are clear enough. The monosyllables which are, as a rule, atonic, often acquire the accent of the word-groups into which they enter, as in *séd-homo*, *séd-homines*, and with the accent they acquire the

power of shortening a following unaccented syllable, as in *séd-haĕc*, *séd-ărgénti*. Groups containing the pronouns *ille*, *iste*, *ipse*, and other weakly accented words, such as *unde*,[1] *omnis*, *esse*, *eccum*, *hercle*, *ergo*, etc., often adopt a similar accentuation; thus, on the analogy of *séd ego*, *séd ea*, *séd eum*, we have *séd ĕius*, *séd ĭlla*, *séd ĭstum*;[2] on the analogy of *séd age*, *séd enim*, we have *séd ĕrgo*, etc. Through false analogy the popular pronunciation sometimes gave to the monosyllable an accent incorrectly and, consequently, disregarded a genuine grammatical accent, as we may see from accentuations like *séd ŭxor*, *pér hŏrtum*, which are occasionally admitted by Plautus. Cases of this last kind are very rare in Terence; Spengel cites only *ého ŏbsecro* (*Andr.* 781), *quód ĭnterest* (*Eun.* 233); cf. *séd ĭnterim* (*Eun.* 607; *Heaut.* 882(1)); *túam ĭnveniri* (*Andr.* 939).

The following table will serve to show at a glance the manner in which the syllable-shortening arises:

	Words.	Word-groups.	Shortening by Analogy.
Dissyllabic	*érus* *ágit*	*séd hic* *tíbi amicus*	*érĭ* *séd haĕc* *tíbi ărgenti*
Trisyllabic	*génere*	*séd ea* *quód enim* *quĭ erit* *quíd habuisset* *quíd opus*	*séd ílla* *quód ĕius* *íta ĕsse* *túam ĭnveniri* *út ĕx-me*
Quadrisyllabic	*géneribus*	*quíd opus-est* *séd etiam* *quĭ homines*	*séd ŏbsecro* * *séd ĭnterim* *quíd ĭnterest*

* All such cases as *séd ŏbsecro*, in which a trisyllabic word of this kind is shortened after a monosyllable, are due to "false analogy."

[1] The examples here used are taken from Spengel, *Einleit. Andria*, p. xxviii ff.

[2] Compare Ahlberg, *Procel.*, p. 49: Haec vocabula cum vocabulo praecedenti proxime coniuncta quasi enclitica fiunt: *ét ipsus*, *út ipsus*, *séd eccum*. This is a statement of the result, not of the process: a special form of accentuation, so

The question may well be asked at this point, What is the accentuation of trisyllabic groups formed by long monosyllables, *i.e.* groups of the form ⏑ ⏑ ⏒? Such groups are not in all respects similar to tribrach groups, for the reason that a somewhat longer pause ('*latens tempus*,' Quintil. IX, 4, 98) falls after a long monosyllable than after a short; hence the long monosyllable possesses a greater independence; compare also the accent *gĕneribus* with *ēxhíbeas*. I propose to discuss the accent of these groups in full elsewhere; it will be sufficient to point out here that the initial accent is the usual, though not the sole, form of pronunciation for the republican period. Thus Plautus and Terence have only *hóc age* in the middle of the verse, although *hoc áge* is very frequently employed in the first foot (cf. p. 68, above); in addition, *hóc age* has always been admitted by the Roman poets in the accentual fifth foot of the hexameter. The recessive accentuation has already been shown by Lindsay and Skutsch to be the rule in such prepositional groups as *ín rem*, *ín mare*, *ín locum;* it is the rule also in groups like *at tu*, *sed tamen*, *et tibi*.

IV. Additional Metrical Tests.

The metrical test which has already been described may be applied in a somewhat different and perhaps a still more striking form. The application to which I refer consists in observing the formation of the proceleusmatic feet. The iambic proceleusmaticus consists of four shorts arranged in pairs, the two pairs being contained as a rule in separate words, *e.g. vides hódie*, *ego tíbi*, and it involves, as is well known, a regular agreement of verse and word accent. Fortunately, by means of the valuable collection which has been made for an entirely different purpose by Ahlberg, *De*

contrary to the general law of the Latin accent, can only have arisen through some widespread and powerful analogy. Yet perhaps we have no right to assume in the first place that in the genuine Roman language two consonants produce definite length in unaccented or in weakly accented syllables, unaccented syllables being those which have neither a genuine primary word-accent nor a metrical accent; cf. Leo, *Plautin. Forsch.*, p. 291; Corssen, *Aussp.* II,^{2} p. 618 ff.

proceleusmaticis, I, p. 131 ff., we can readily examine the formation of all the iambic proceleusmatici which occur in the dramatic poets of the republic. In Ahlberg's collection we find forty-two examples of the type *vides áb ea* (inclusive of nine examples which involve syllable-shortening, as in *rogat út illum*), but of the type *sed ab éa* we find only a single case, *i.e. Cist.* 594 *ego ad ánum*, which may be excused by the license of the first foot, cf. p. 65, above.[1] Hence proceleusmatici of the types *sed ab éa*, *id ut érus*, *et homo úbi*, *neque ego ámo* are evidently avoided by the iambic poets, although in these assumed types the thesis is formed in a thoroughly legitimate manner (see Ahlberg, *l.l.*, I, 10 ff.), and although the dissyllabic arsis also is one of the most usual forms, see *ibid.*, p. 23. Hence, since neither the assumed formation of the thesis is avoided taken separately nor that of the arsis taken separately, it is clear that the avoidance of these types is due to the effect produced by the two formations when occurring together, and this effect is none other than the false accent *sed ab éa*, *neque ego ámo*. The twelve examples of the type *vides áb ea* cited by Ahlberg from Terence are as follows — from the iambic trimeter (*l.l.*, p. 135 f.): *Andr.* 737 ego quíd agas; *Heaut.* 872 ego dómi ero; *Phorm.* 98 ea síta erat (see Ahlberg, p. 156); *Eun.* 509 video áb ea; *Phorm.* 48 alio, úbi erit; — from the iambic sept. and oct. (p. 140 f.): *Phorm.* 491 capiti. ‖ ídem ego; *Eun.* 309 modo quód ames; *Ad.* 192 si ego tíbi illam; — from the trochaic sept. (p. 149 f.): *Phorm.* 346 vide quíd agas; *Heaut.* 966 tibi quí erat; *Eun.* 224 vide quíd agas; — from the trochaic oct. (p. 151): *Eun.* 618 rogat út illum. Similar examples from Plautus and the dramatic fragments are: *Bacch.* 508; *Men.* 70; *Mil.* 136; *Stich.* 419; *Poen.* 693; Enn. *trag. frgm.* 297; Fab. tog. Titin. 98; *Mil.* 1257; 1276; *Asin.* 430; *Most.* 176; *Truc.* 131; *Poen.* 818; *Truc.* 581;

[1] Only apparent exceptions are offered by Naev. *com. frgm.* 21 quis heri ápud te, and by Schöll's text of *Truc.* 693 isquidem hic ápud nos (Mss.: apud nos est hic), since *dpŭd-te*, *dpŭd-nos* are really trisyllabic. Only apparent also is the exception *Epid.* 593 númquid ego íbi, where the real division is num quid-ego íbi (see p. 84, p. 98, below). On the other hand, extremely doubtful even in the first foot is such a procel. as Fleck. reads with the Calliopian Mss. in *Heaut.* 934: *et id érit*, where Umpf. and Dz. read with A *post, ét id.*

Mil. 994; *Rud.* 731; *Truc.* 879; *Aul.* 734; *Epid.* 641; *Men.* 162; *Most.* 305; 833; *Pers.* 832; *Capt.* 461; *Curc.* 160; 170; *Trin.* 715; *Amph.* 748; Pacuv. *trag. frgm.* 99; *Pseud.* 1283.

The Latin accentuation of *sed agit* as a single word is also made probable by some of the general rules of Latin prosody. Two of these may be mentioned here: (1) the absence of a full or genuine word-end within the trisyllabic group is shown by its admission in all the uneven feet (see p. 92, below) to form the iambic anapaest, *i.e. sed agúnt*, since the thesis of this shortened, this exceptionally swift anapaest does not in general admit division by a word-end; see Ritschl, *Proleg.*, p. ccxxxvii; Klotz, *Grundz.*, p. 307.[1] (2) The general law of Latin prosody against the placing of monosyllables before the pauses is evidently based upon their proclitic character; for it is a rule of the Graeco-Roman poetry that a full word-end must fall at the end of a metrical period (Rossbach-Westphal, *Metr.* II², p. 106), and such a word-end scarcely falls in Latin within a complex like *si-bona*.

V. Terentian Usage in Detail.

It seems desirable to explain clearly the system of measurements upon which the following statistics for the accentuation of tribrach groups in Terence are based. In cases which involve a primary accent, such as *íd agis*, the measurement of the tribrach requires no explanation, but in cases involving a secondary accent, it must be borne in mind that the secondary group should be measured from the place of the primary grammatical accent. Thus in *Eun.* 931: *mŏdo ădŭles|centulus*, the rule is not violated because the first part of the phrase is quadrisyllabic when estimated from the place of the primary accent in *adulescéntulus;* on the other hand *hŏmo ădŭlescens* (*Phorm.* 1041) and pŏl ĕgo ămator (cf. *Eun.* 936 *cúm*

[1] The metrical law of Lachmann and Ritschl which forbids the divided thesis of the anapaest, etc., is subjected to thoroughgoing criticism by Maurenbrecher, *Hiatus und Verschleifung im alt. Lat.*, Leipzig, 1899, p. 26 ff; Maurenbrecher's careful analysis (*l.l.*, p. 31) proves only that the law is not one of absolute validity, which we have little right to expect it to be in the case of poets so little bound by fixed conventions as the Roman dramatists.

amatóre) are the only admissible accents in genuine trisyllabic groups. In the cases, also, where the last member of a trisyllabic phrase coalesces through elision with some following word, as in *qŭid ĕg(o) hodie* (Plaut. *Most.* 531), there is clearly no violation of the rule; for this phrase may be considered as made up not of *quid* and *ego* alone (*quíd-ego*), but of *quid* and *égo-hodie;* cf. *Andr.* 684 *ubi úbi erit*, though we find only *úbi ubi* alone. Similarly the complex character of the following prepositional phrases with *apud* is clear: *Andr.* 254 mihi ăpŭd-fŏrum; *Heaut.* 377 scio, ăpŭd-pătrem. Finally not every chance occurrence of the forms ⏑, ⏑ ⏓ and ⏑, ⏑, ⏓ constitutes a trisyllabic sentence-group, but the words involved must at least belong to the same clause and be connected in the sentence-enunciation. Where the words belong to different clauses, set off by punctuation, the rule does not apply. Hence I omit from these statistics examples both (1) of the form ⏑; ⏖ ⏑ and (2) of the form ⏖; ⏑ ⏑, viz., (1) *Eun.* 630 fit, úbi; *Heaut.* 154 fit, úbi; 628*[1] ego, érus; *Phorm.* 1029 sic dabo: áge; Hec. 610 pol. ‖ ábi; 637 fit. ‖ éa; *Ad.* 646 Quid? ‖ égo; cf. 943 haecquidem. ‖ áge; 946* quid? ‖ égo (Dziatzko); 982 da modo. ‖ áge. — (2) *Andr.* 713 siquíd. ‖ age; *Heaut.* 974 égo, id obesse; *Eun.* 252 négo; ait?; cf. 381 síne. ‖ at enim istaec. To practically the same head should be referred two apparent exceptions in which the monosyllable is closely connected with the preceding word through elision, and at the same time is separated from the following dissyllable by the principal caesura, *e.g.*:

Eun. 512: Ubi véni, caús(am), ut | íbi manérem, répperít.
Ibid. 394 Triúmphat. ‖ hóc provís(o) ut, | úbi tempús siét.

It would be harsh and unnatural in these examples to read *ut* | *ibí*, *ut* | *ubí* and thus place a caesura within the shortened anapaest; we should rather consider *ut-ibi* as separated by a species of tmesis and *causam ut* when followed by the principal caesura as equivalent to a single word in the same manner in which we are accustomed to read well-known

[1] * indicates passages where the text is uncertain and editors are at variance.

Vergilian lines such as 'Multum *ille et* | terris,' where *illet* is metrically a single word; cf. L. Müller, *Res Metr.*, pp. 275, 350. In conclusion we may summarize the rule for measuring and accenting trisyllabic groups as follows: Any three short syllables, the first of which is a monosyllable or a dissyllable reduced to a monosyllable by elision, receive the metrical accent only upon the initial syllable, *i.e.* ◡́, ◡ ◡ or ◡́, ◡, ◡, in case the three shorts immediately precede a fixed word-accent and belong to the same clause.

I shall consider the example of tribrach groups occurring in Terence under the following divisions: A. necessary cases of the accentuation *séd agit* (with 2 subdivisions): B. apparent exceptions, such as *at íta me, quod ópus est:* C. real exceptions attested by the Mss. transmission.

A. Necessary Cases of the Accent séd agit. — (*a*) Cases in which the quantity of the final syllable is certain in each individual case, inclusive of the cases of final *-s* not making position in thesis. Especially noteworthy are the phrases *séd agis, agit, aget, age, ea, eris, erit, erus, era, ita, opus, ego opinor*, etc. Cf. quíd agis *Andr.* 134; *Heaut.* 947; 976; *Phorm.* 216; *Ad.* 60; 780; — quáe agis *Ad.* 680; — sát agit *Heaut.* 225 (Mss. reading); — quí aget Phorm. 27; — áge age *Heaut.* 332; 722; *Phorm.* 662; *Ad.* 877. In *Heaut.* 611 most editors read:

'Nón emó': quid ágis? || Optáta lóquere. || Quí ? || Non ést opús.

But Fleck. has already adopted here the reading of the best Mss. of the Calliopian recension, viz., *ages* D^1G^1 (P gis *in ras.*), on the ground that the future tense is better suited to the sense, cf. v. 608: égon? ad Menedemum íbo: dicam. For the textual corruption, compare especially *Ad.* 343, where all Mss. except A have *quid agis* instead of the *quid ages* required by the sense. [Note further quíd agis Acc. *trag. frgm.* 191 R.; Lucil. XXIX, No. 31 M.; — íd agit Enn. *trag. frgm.* 185 R.; — quód agis Terentianus Maurus 2368; *quid ágis* occurs once in the whole Roman literature in an apparently sound text, viz., Sen. *Troad.* 607 *quid ágis*, Ulíxe, where it may be explained as due to the license of the first foot. Ac-

cording to the references for *agis* in Lodge's *Lexicon Plautinum* the type *séd agis* is found in Plautus 47 times in the following phrases: quíd agis (28 times), siquíd agis (6 times), quó agis (2), tú agis (2), té agis (3), ví agis (1), rém agis (1), béne agis (1), mále agis (1), quód agis (1), ídagis (1), cf. for the last *Corp. Gloss. Lat.* II 761, 11, 12. Plautus also has quíd agit (3 times), túa agit (uxor) (1), sátagit (1); the corrupt texts *Aul.* 658, *Mil.* 811 are omitted. There are only 4 passages in the dramatists in which the scansion *quid ágĭs* (instead of *quid agĭs*) is even possible, viz. *Rud.* 337; *Eun.* 378; 797; Acc. *trag. frgm.* 135 R.; three of these cases belong to the first foot. The type *séd age* (references in Lodge, *Lex. Plaut.*) occurs in Plautus 6 times as follows: séd age (1), áge age (2), rém age (1), pálam age (1), túa age (1).]

Andr. 337 nísi ea; 837 úbi ea; *Heaut.* 334 án ea; *Phorm.* 480 quíd eum? || Ut; 1015 séd ea;—*Andr.* 420 tíbi erit; 684 úbi erit; *Phorm.* 889 dátum erit; *Hec.* 474 méo erit;—quíd ita *Andr.* 371; *Eun.* 366; 725; 861; 897; 959; 1008; *Heaut.* 610; *Phorm.* 568;—*Heaut.* 874 néque ita; 941 séd ita; *Ad.* 161 án ita; 483 nísi ita;—*Phorm.* 47 úbi era; 634 út erus; cf. 471 et quídem ere, which may, however, be taken as etquídem ere. Umpf. and Dz. read *tibi ére Andr.* 508, but the text is corrupt and the order much confused in the Mss.; Fairclough now reads *tíbi erc*, Fleckeisen *tíbi renúntio, ére.* An exception might seem to be offered also by *Hec.* 799:

Edepol né *meam érus* esse óperam députát parví pretí,

but we need not hesitate to accept here the order which is found in D (and also in F): *ēē erus*, i.e. *ésse erus.* [Note also quó erus Pompon. *com. frgm.* 45 R. According to a collection of examples which in part is based upon the Lemaire *Index* and is, therefore, only approximately complete, Plautus has the type *séd erus* (*ere, era*) 31 times. The four passages in which either *sed érus* or *sed erŭs* (with length by position) is possible, are to be read according to the latter scansion, since certain cases of *erŭs* are not rare in Plautus. The accent *nisi érus* in a single apparently correct text (*Poen.* 839) may be explained as due to the license of the first foot

of a colon (fifth foot of the septenarius).] — quíd opus, *Andr.* 490; *Phorm.* 762; — *Phorm.* 440 siquíd opus, *i.e.* si quíd opus; 654 sed míhi opus (probable scansion); 681 tíbi opus; 716 íta opus; *Ad.* 996 quód opus. The ambiguous passage *Eun.* 223 sí sit opus, vel tótum is to be read *opŭs*, as is also *Ad.* 617 id anŭs mihi; for certain cases of *opŭs* in Terence, see *Heaut.* 80; *Ad.* 254, etc. [Note also Afran. *com. frgm.* 145 R. fít opus; Titin. *com. frgm.* 4 R. íd opus; cf. Pompon. *com. frgm.* 66 R. áge anus. The usage of Plautus is similar in respect both to *opus* and to *anus;* a single exception, in ópus *Vidul.* 75, is due to the license of the first foot.] For apparent exceptions occurring in *quid ópus-est* and similar phrases with *est*, see p. 87, below.

Hec. 538 út ego opínor; for the numerous examples of this phrase in Plautus, where it is always similarly accented, see Kämpf, *Pronom. Personal*, p. 4; cf. *Andr.* 179 néque ut opinor; *Eun.* 22 quóm ibi adessent; 242 quáe habitudost; 522 quíd habuisset; 588 ín alienas; 606 pól ego is essem; 764 vólo ego adesse; 926 quód ei amorem; *Heaut.* 191 ád eam in urbem; 592 tíbi opis; 637 át id omitto; 836 pró alimentis; *Phorm.* 94 míhi onus; cf. 175 égo in eum incidi; 332 quía enim in illis; 412 égo adipiscar; 509 quód homo inhumanissumus; 531 séd utut; 545 Géta alienus; 553 siquíd opis; 1041 hómo adulescens; 1046 quód is iubebit; cf. *Ad.* 232 túm agam ubi[1] illinc. (*Total* 73.)

(*β*) Cases in which the quantities of the final syllables are not perhaps altogether certain in single cases, but are sufficiently certain collectively. It is generally agreed by Terentian critics that many final syllables which were 'half-long' or prevailingly long in Plautus are to be considered as definitely short in Terence; thus verbal forms in *-at* and *-et* which were originally iambic, such as *erat*, *amat*, *amet*, *habet*, are pyrrhics in Terence (see Bömer, *De correptione vocab. iamb. Terentiana*, p. 12); *homo* retains a long final only in arsis (Bömer, *l.l.*, p. 18; Fabia, *ed. Ad.*, p. 55); *ego*, *ibi*, *ubi* have a long final only in arsis, and even then in very rare cases

[1] A dissyllable when elided is commonly treated as a monosyllable in Latin.

(Klotz, *Grundz.*, p. 51 f.; Bömer, *l.l.*, p. 34, p. 63; Hauler, *Anh. z. Phorm.*, v. 176). On the other hand verbal forms of the first and second persons, such as *ago, ero, eras, habes, abis,* are probably to be considered as having more often a long final in Terence; hence cases like *Andr.* 614 íd ago, 714 domi eró,[1] will not be included in this collection. On the principles just stated we have the following examples of groups involving the so-called 'half-longs': (1) *erat, amat, amet, habet; Eun.* 736 sát erat (or *sáterat*, like *poterat;* see Leo, *Plaut. Forsch.*, p. 266; L. Müller, *Res. Metr.*, p. 466 f., and compare the word-division in the Plautus Mss.); *Heaut.* 629 séd erat; 966 quí erat; *Phorm.* 97 síta erat; 768 sát erat (saterat); *Ad.* 494 míhi erat; *Eun.* 986 quíd? amat?; *Ad.* 341 quóm amet; *Andr.* 954 quía habet; *Heaut.* 835 décem habet; *Phorm.* 1041 sí habet; *Ad.* 382 síbi habet; — (2) *homo:* mí homo *Andr.* 721; *Phorm.* 1005; *Ad.* 336; — *Andr.* 778 pól homo; *Eun.* 960 quís homo; — (3) *apu(a), ibi, ubi:* cf. *Phorm.* 198 módo apŭd portum; *Andr.* 343 séd ubi; 928 ís ubi; *Eun.* 719 párem ubi; *Heaut.* 983 ét ibi; cf. *Phorm.* 827 séd ubi nam; cf. *Ad.* 527 mé, ubi; 570 scío ubi. On the other hand in two ambiguous passages we should scan *ubī* and *ibī: Eun.* 414 is ubí molestus; *Ad.* 584 quid ibí facit; the latter is rightly so scanned by Spengel, for the original quantity is preferable on other grounds in the pure seventh foot of the septenarius. (*Total* 24.)

(4) The following phrases occur with *ego* in Terence: *án ego, át ego, ecquíd ego* (i.e. *ec quíd ego*), *ét ego,* (*et quídem ego*), *íd ego, ídem ego, nám ego, néque ego, nísi ego, quási ego, quíd ego, quód ego, quám ego, quém ego, quóm ego, séd ego, tíbi ego, túam ego, vír ego, úbi ego, út ego:* — *Andr.* 252; 508 (íd ego, rightly scanned as trochaic verse by Fleck. and Faircl.); 519; 563; 612; 850; 886; 944; *Eun.* 142; 265; 293; 496; 822; 930; 958; 1081; 1086; *Heaut.* 191; 252; 529 (quid ego ni); 563; 631; 663; 686; 956; 993; 1032; *Phorm.* 491; 519; 587; 685; 844; 1000; 1031; 1052; *Hec.* 98; (195: et quídem ego, or etquídem ego); 408; 524; 564; 850 (rightly scanned as tro-

[1] This is the accentuation of Spengel and Fleck., and is approved by C. F. W. Müller, *Plaut. Pros.*, pp. 155, 182; other editors accent wrongly *domi éro.*

chaic by Umpf. and Dz.); *Ad.* 128; 256; 378; 568; 749*; 784; 877 (*ecquíd ego*); 916; (946, Umpf.); 972 (*Total* 50). In the example *ecquíd ego* cited from *Ad.* 877 we have what appears at first the inadmissible accentuation of a trochaic word upon the ultima, cf. Podiaski, *l.l.*, p. 62; but this accentuation is only apparent; for all the compounds formed of two monosyllables admit in early Latin of being resolved into their original parts (Ritschl, *Proleg.*, p. ccxxii f.; Klotz, *Grundz.*, p. 324). Hence we may write here if we wish *ec quíd ego*, just as we often find this division in the Plautus Mss. (*e.g.* in B ec quid *Cas.* 242, et quid *Amph.* 577, etc.), and as Leo writes in Sen. *Oed.* 263 quid *quíd ego* fugi; see also the latter's remarks, *Plaut. Forsch.*, p. 236. The extent to which the expressions containing *ego* have acquired a fixed order and become phraseological may be seen from the fact that the full form *quíd ego* without elision occurs in Terence 13 times, *quód ego* 7 times, *át ego* and *séd ego* 4 times each, *ét ego* 3 times, etc. That *quídego* and *quídĭlle* possess most of the characteristics of actual compounds may be seen further from the fact that they take precedence over the compound *quidni* or *quinni*[1]; for in connection with *ego* and *ille quidni* (*quinni*) suffers tmesis and the forms *quid ego ni* (*Heaut.* 529), *quid illam ni* (*Ad.* 662) result; for additional examples, see Plessis on *Ad.* 662 and Brix-Niemeyer on *Mil.* 1120. Hence so far as the actual usage of the language is concerned, Priscian (Keil, III, 24, 23 f.) appears to be mistaken when he says that the conjunctions enter into composition with no words which are declined except with the indefinite pronouns, *i.e.* in *siquis*, *nequis*, *numquis*. We may be sure that if the Latin grammarians had had occasion to develop fully this topic and to discuss in an independent manner the compounds capable of being formed with the help of conjunctions, they would have shown differences of opinion at this point, just as they differ widely in the lists which they give of the compound conjunctions and of the prepositions which may serve to form compound verbs (on the latter contrast, for example, Priscian, Keil,

[1] For the latter form, see Cledonius, Keil, V, 66, 16; *Corp. Gloss. Lat.* IV, 158, 19, etc.

III, 56, 9 f. with Donatus, IV, 366, 10 f., who excluding only *apud* and *penes* leaves ample room for such compounds as *contrafacere*, *proptervolare*,[1] *propteresse*, etc.). We can certainly recognize no difference in closeness of connection between *si-quis* and *si-ego*, between *ec-quis* and *et-ille*, and if the question be decided on the basis of the accent to which Priscian so constantly appeals in the determination of *composita* and on the basis of such usages as *quid ego ni*, we should be compelled to recognize the phrases which are made up of conjunctions and of the personal or demonstrative pronouns as *composita* in the sense of improper compounds.[2] On the other hand, if we adopt the traditional orthography, *i.e.* the usual word-division, as our standard, we shall recognize more justification for Priscian's statement; for *siquis*, *ecquis*, *quisquis*, etc., are written very frequently together in Mss. and inscriptions, while we find, *e.g.* in the Plautus Mss., the orthography *polego*, *quiaego*, *sedego*, *siego*, etc., less frequently. That *séd ego* is the only accent known to Terence is also strikingly shown by the small number of cases in which the scansion appears doubtful. For Terentian critics are agreed that the scansion *egō* is quite rare in Terence, and consequently we are not at liberty to assume this scansion freely. In point of fact, while *séd ego* is certain in 50 passages, we shall need to assume *sed egō* in only 3 passages, viz. *Heaut.* 309 ita tímui. ‖ at egó (2) nihil ésse; 610 núnc tibi egó (6) respóndeo; *Hec.* 243 etsí scio egó (2), Philúmená. There are no

[1] Havet writes *proptervolans* as a compound in Phaedrus; see his remarks, *ed. Phaedr.*, p. 218, § 93.

[2] Lindsay, *Lat. Lang*, p. 361 ff., has some just remarks upon word-groups as distinguished from genuine compounds, and upon the difficulty of always distinguishing sharply between the two. Since the present study is for obvious reasons based upon the ancient terminology, I have purposely taken no account of the difference which exists in modern usage between the two terms; see further, p. 100, below. Upon the difficulty of distinguishing genuine composition from 'enclisis' in many cases, see also Stolz, *Hist. Gramm. d. lat. Sprache*, I, p. 404 ff. Of course the true view is that neither *siquis* nor *siego*, neither *etenim* nor *quidenim*, neither *respublica* nor *iusiurandum*, etc., are genuine compounds in the modern sense, though all alike are *composita* according to the grammarians' use of the term, which is based primarily upon the meaning and the accentuation (*e. g.* Priscian, Keil, II, 177, 15 ff.).

other passages in Terence which present any difficulty; for in *Andr.* 762 the reading tibi díco ego án (Umpf., Fleck.) is as well supported as tibi egó dico án, and in *Eun.* 155 Umpf. retains the Ms. reading aut égo in place of the correction at egó. Cases like *Andr.* 967 ét quidem égo, *i.e.* étquidem égo scarcely require mention after the researches of Luchs (*Comm. Prosod.* II) and Ahlberg (*Procel.* I, p. 62 ff.) upon the enclisis of *quidem* and in view of the orthography *hicquidem*, *illequidem*, etc., now generally adopted by our editors. Besides the *compositum étquidem*, like *éttamen*, *sédtamen*, *sítamen*, etc., is expressly attested by the grammarians (Audax, Keil, VII, 349, 18). Here belong also *Andr.* 164 quémquidem égo si; *Heaut.* 532 ídquidem égo, si. For examples involving *ego me* (*egome*) and *ego sum* (*egosum*), see the treatment of quadrisyllabic groups below (p. 90).

(5) Cases of *ăïs* and *ăït* seem to acquire a separate treatment, since Fleckeisen has shown that this verb was originally inflected according to the fourth conjugation and with long final syllable; cf. Brix-Niemeyer on *Men.* 487. Whether, however, the long final of *aïs* is retained by Terence under any conditions is extremely doubtful; for this scansion, though accepted by Hauler and by most editors, rests solely upon the uncertain reading *aïs advéntum* in *Phorm.* 315; the two other passages sometimes quoted, *Hec.* 346 and *Ad.* 570 *quid aïs?* may both be explained like decipís? *Phorm.* 528, as cases of *syllaba anceps in pausa* (see Hauler's note on *Phorm.* 528; Bömer, *l.l.*, p. 11). In any case the final syllable of *aïs* is short in thesis in Terence, and the phrases *quíd aïs*, *quid tú aïs*, *quíd aït*, etc., are to be considered tribrach groups in the following passages: *Andr.* 184; 517; 575; 588; 616; 665*; 872; 933 (quid tú aïs); *Eun.* 334; 425; 654; 748; 829; 948; 957; *Heaut.* 182; 303 (quíd aït); 701; *Phorm.* 199; 380 (túom aïs); 383 (quí aïs); 700 (út aïs); 755; 873; 1004; *Hec.* 236; 523; *Ad.* 556; 920 (quid tú aïs). (*Total*, 29.)

(6) Cases involving *enim* require special mention. As is well known, the final *m* of this particle was especially weak in early Latin, and Leo, *Plaut. Forsch.*, p. 302 ff., has even made an attempt to show that it was not pronounced before

the time of Lucilius. This extreme view, which Leo would himself probably now wish to modify, must be rejected for many reasons, and especially because it is not possible to accent *et éni*, *at éni* in Plautus and Terence. It is, however, a reasonable view that except in arsis the final *m* of *enim*, like the final *s* of other words, was very faintly pronounced in early Latin; hence the following cases of *át eni*, *ét eni*,[1] *íd eni*, *quía eni*, *quíd eni* probably belong among tribrach groups: *Andr.* 848; *Eun.* 751; 1074; *Heaut.* 317 (bis); 713; 800; *Phorm.* 487; *Hec.* 311; *Ad.* 730; 830. (*Total*, 11.)

B. Apparent Exceptions, which are really Quadrisyllabic Groups. — It remains to notice those cases in which the group ⏑, ⏑ ⏑ appears at first to be accented upon the second syllable, but in which the accentuation is really ⏑, ⏝, ⏒ through the attachment of an enclitic at the farther end of the phrase. These groups which are few in number may be distinguished very definitely; they are formed either by the attachment of the substantive verb in certain phrases, as *opus est* (cf. *opust*), *ego sum* (*egosum*), or by the attachment of the personal pronouns, as in the formulae *ego me*, *ego te*, etc. (*egome*, *egote*), *ita me* (*itame*).

(1) It has long been recognized by metricians that parts of the substantive verb like *est*, *sit*, *sum*, *sim* constitute one phrase with the preceding word, especially if the latter be a word ending in a pyrrhic, a trochee, or a tribrach (L. Müller, *Res Metr.*, p. 466; cf. Lindsay, *Lat. Lang.*, p. 167, and *Classical Review*, V (1891), p. 405). It can cause no surprise then to find the accents *sed-ópus-est*[2] and *séd opus est* equally frequent in the dramatic poets. Terence has four cases of the former: *Heaut.* 558; *Ad.* 601; *Andr.* 638; 265 sed núnc perópus est, *i.e. per ópus est*.[3] He has also four cases of

[1] On *etenim* in Terence, see Clement, *A.J.P.* XVIII, 414; in *Eun.* 1074 *et enim* still has, according to Langen (*Beiträge*, p. 271), the meaning of "und wahrlich." On postpositive *etenim*, see Clement, *A.J.P.* VII, 82; similarly, we often find in the poets postpositive *sed enim*, *neque enim*, *quid enim*.

[2] With *sed ópus est*, compare cases like *excúte-dum* (*Aul.* 646), *circumspice-dum* (*Most.* 472), *accipe-sis* (*Pers.* 412); see Ritschl, *Opusc.* II, 568; Klotz, *Grundz.*, p. 311.

[3] Compounds with intensive *per-* are separable compounds, as *Andr.* 486, *per*

the latter: *Eun.* 479; *Phorm.* 560; *Hec.* 768; 865. The influence of the copula upon the accent is usually but not necessarily confined to frequent formulae; thus the dramatists have no example of *sed érus est*, yet we find Com. frgm. *inc. inc.* 74[2] R. *hic áger est.* A second very frequent formula is *ego sum*, and the evidence that it was often viewed by the Roman as a single word is complete. Thus *egosum* is glossed as one word, *Corp. Gloss. Lat.*, III, 406, 4, it is provided with an abbreviation in the *Commentarii Not. Tironian.*, it is counted as a word of six letters in the ingeniously constructed verses of the *carmina duodecim sapientium*, Baehrens, *Poet. Lat. min.* IV, p. 120, v. 10 (see Baehrens, *l.l.*, I, *praef.*, p. XII), finally it is not infrequently written as a single word in the 'vetus' of Plautus, *e.g. egosum*, *Mil.* 427; *atégosum* pérditus, *Poen.* 1379; for the similar enclitic forms *potissum*, *potissit*, etc., see Leo, *Plaut. Forsch.*, p. 267, and Neue-Wagener, *Formenlehre d. lat. Spr.* II, p. 176 f. Hence Terence writes *Andr.* 245 quémquam ut égo sum; cf. *Heaut.* 825 ego hómo sum (or, homō sum), but he has also quám ego súm, *Eun.* 527 and *Phorm.* 808.[1]

ecastor *scitus* puer; see Lindsay, *Lat. Lang.*, p. 198. Altogether similar to *perópus est* are the Plautine *nescio quis*, *nescio pol*, i.e. *ne scioquis*, etc., on which see Luchs, *Hermes*, VI, 264 ff.

[1] Similarly, punctuation is very possibly intentionally omitted *Mon. Anc.* I, 28 ductisunt; VI, 16 [appe]llatussum. The present context naturally suggests some comment upon the formulae *est enim*, *sunt enim.* As is well known, the difference between — *est enim*, the regular order, and — *enim est*, the occasional order, has been much discussed; for the literature of the subject, see Reisig-Schmalz, *Vorles.* III, 850 f. The view of Madvig (*de Fin.*, p. 92) and Dräger (*Histor. Syntax*, II, 164 f.) on this question is correct, *i.e.* in the position *sapientia est enim* the copula is formally enclitic and forms a word-complex with *sapientia.* Hence the form of statement adopted by Neue-Wagener, *Formenlehre d. lat. Spr.* II, p. 977 ff., is not wholly satisfactory: "Sehr häufig steht *enim* an dritter Stelle, wenn eine Form von *esse*, besonders *est*, mit einem Worte oder einem Satztheile vorausgeht, wie *acta est enim*, *pro Cluent.* 37, 104." It should rather be said that in such cases *enim* stands in what is apparently the third place; for in examples like *satis est enim*, *expressa sunt enim*, the particle no more occupies the third place in reality than it does in the examples *a Graecis enim*, *ab iis enim* (also cited by Neue), where it stands after a preposition and its case. This arrangement constitutes the regular usage, as may be seen from the examples in Neue and Dräger. On the other hand, as Priscian so often teaches, word-com-

(2) While Plautus and Terence commonly know only the accent *séd ita, án ita, néque ita* and the like (see the examples cited p. 81), a special case is presented by *at ita me* in the imprecatory formulae. Langen (*Rhein. Mus.* XII (1857), p. 426 ff.) has shown that the position of the personal pronoun *me* is fixed for each individual formula of this kind, and that in those formulae which contain the particle *ita* the pronoun always follows immediately upon the particle, *i.e. ita me di ament, ita me servet Iuppiter*, etc. The stereotyped character which belongs to the asseverative formulae in general is also aptly described by Kellerhoff, *Studem. Stud.* II, p. 77: "(Earum) verba adeo inter se cohaerent, ut fere individua esse nec quaedam a quibusdam separari posse videantur." Hence, through the enclisis of the personal pronoun, *ita me* becomes practically a trisyllabic word in the frequent formula *íta-me dí-ament;* cf. especially Wackernagel, *Indogerm. Forsch.* I, p. 410. Hence we find *ita me* actually written as one word in the 'decurtatus,' *Merc.* 762, and we find the whole formula written together (cf. *mehercule, mediusfidius*) in the 'vetus,' *Poen.* 1413 *itamediament*, i.e. *ìtamedíament* (for this accentuation of the phrase, which is the normal one, see Hauler's note on *Phorm.* 165). Much less frequent than *ita me* in the imprecatory formulae is the fuller form with prefixed *at*, i.e. *at ita me*, which constitutes a quadrisyllabic group. In this group the accent *at íta me* is found twice in Terence, once in Plautus: *Phorm.* 807 vin scíre? *at íta me* sérvet Iúppiter; *Hec.* 258; *Mil.* 501. Here belong also the following examples of *bene, íta me: Eun.* 1037 Bene, íta me

plexes (*compositae dictiones*) are also occasionally separated in actual use; hence we sometimes find the order *-enim est*, as Cic. *Cat. mai.* § 24, nemo enim est tam senex. This latter becomes the regular order in such combinations as *quid-enim est* (*Cat. mai.* § 5), *neque-enim est* (*Tusc.* 4, 22, § 50), *is-enim est* (*Fin.* 3, 22, § 75); see still other examples in Dräger, *l.l.*, II, 165, and in Hand, *Tursell.* II, p. 400 ff.; at the same time the distinction made by Hand, viz., that *quid* is emphatic in the order *quid enim est*, and *est* emphatic in the order *quid est enim*, may be true. Very instructive also to the student of Latin accentual groups are the additional examples of Cicero's usage quoted by Neue-Wagener, *l.l.*, p. 979 f., *i.e. opus erat enim, satis erat enim, eius rei enim, et formae enim, hoc quoque enim, nihilo minus enim, non lubet enim, non modo enim, quo modo enim, quae potest enim, quam multi enim, si quando enim*, etc.

dí ament, factum; *Hec.* 642; *Phorm.* 883. [In Plautus, according to the examples cited by Lodge, *Lex. Plaut.*, p. 113, the initial accent *át ita me* is found five times,[1] *néque ita me* is found once.]

(3) The same enclisis of the personal pronoun appears in the familiar locutions *ego me*, *ego te*, *ego vos*, etc., where, in the Latin word-order, the two pronouns assume a fixed position in relation to each other; cf. Rein, *De pronom. ap. Ter. collocatione*, Leipzig, 1879, p. 3 f.; Mahler, *De pronom. ap. Plaut. collatione*, Gryphisw., 1876, p. 3 ff. Metrical scholars have already observed in their study of the caesura that the pyrrhics *mihi*, *tibi*, *ego* form practically a single word with a following pronoun (see Waltz, *La langue et la métrique d'Horace*, p. 187 f.), and this observation is fully confirmed by the evidence of the glosses and the Mss., which sometimes write the two together, *i.e. Corp. Gloss. Lat.* III, 524, 13 '*ɛtegote*' (where, however, the Greek κὰγώ σɛ stands first); *Mil.* 23 '*egome*' B; *Poen.* 1407 '*egote*' BC. Hence Plautus uses almost equally the accentuations *ét ego te* and *et égo te*. Terence has certainly *ét* (*quíd*, *pér*, *ibi*) *ego te* with initial accent in the following passages: *Andr.* 533; 536; 834; *Eun.* 338; *Hec.* 610, while the accent on the second syllable perhaps occurs in the disputed passage *Andr.* 289 *hánc per égo te* (so Spengel, but most editors read *quod pér ego té*).

C. Genuine Exceptions. Statistics. — The Terence Mss. offer three examples of exceptional accentuation in tribrach groups which appear to be textually sound, *i.e. Hec.* 200 quícquam *ab áli*[4]*arum* íngenio úllam; *Eun.* 661 aliquíd *domo ábe*[4]*untem* ábstulísse; *ib.* 107 Samiá mihi máter fúit, *ea hábi*[2]*tabát* Rhodí. Of these examples the third alone is sufficiently excused[2] by the difficulty of forming the verse-close (cf. p. 67 f., above).

[1] This includes *Poen.* 1258, where it is necessary to correct the Ms. reading *át me ita* to *át ita mé*.

[2] It is perhaps possible that the two remaining exceptions, although they are not excused, are mitigated somewhat by the continuous elision, *i.e. dom(o) abeunt(em) abstulisse*. For certain licenses in the treatment of a word are perhaps occasionally introduced through the elision of the ultima; thus Skutsch, *Forsch.*, p. 107 ff., accepts *ămăb(am)*.

It seems desirable to exhibit in brief statistical form the results which we have reached in an extended examination of the tribrach groups in Terence. In the following table all examples in which the quantity of the final syllable is certain for single cases are represented by *ea;* examples which involve *erat, amat, amet, habet* are represented by *erat;* those which involve *ibi, ubi, homo* (*opús*), by *ibi;* those which involve *enim* are not included in the table.

	Initial Accent.	Ambiguous.	Medial.	
Ea	73		3	
Erat . . .	12			
Ibi	12	3		
Ego . . .	50	3		
Aïs . . .	29	(2)		
Total . .	176	6(8)	3	

Those who have followed my analysis of the several kinds of examples will, I believe, agree with me in the view that cases admitting the accent *sed ibí, sed opús* cannot really have been ambiguous to the Romans of the republic; at the most it will be admitted that the Romans of this period may have hesitated in reading the three cases of *ego.* Hence, classing these cases only as genuinely ambiguous and estimating them at half value, I reach the conclusion that the ratio of the initial accent to the medial in the tribrach groups of Terence may be placed at 176 : $4\frac{1}{2}$, or at about 40 : 1.

Those who are acquainted with the principles on which the verse of the early dramatists is constructed will know how to interpret the frequent cases in which the initial accentuations occur several times in the same verse:

Ad. 780: Nostín? || Jam scíbo. || *Quíd agis? quó abis?* || Mítte mé.
Phorm. 216: Non póssum adésse. || Ah *quid agis? quó abis,* Ántiphó?
Heaut. 317: *Quíd-íllo* fácias? || *Át enim.* || *Quíd enim?* || *Sí sinás,* dicám. || Siné.
Ad. 680: *Ét sció:* nam *té amo: quó magis quáe agis* cúrae súnt mihí.

Phorm. 199: *Quíd agam?* || *Quíd aïs?* || *Huíus patrém* vidísse mé, patruóm tuóm.

See also *Heaut.* 191; *Phorm.* 1041, etc.

D. Observance of the Dipodic Law. — Since trisyllabic groups, like *sed agunt* or *idagunt*, are freely allowed by the republican dramatic poets to form the iambic anapaest, and since the thesis of this shortened anapaest, according to the well-known metrical law, cannot be divided between two words, it follows, as I have already pointed out (p. 78), that *sed agunt* was regarded by the republican poets as very nearly the equivalent of a single anapaestic word.[1] Still another proof of this fact remains to be pointed out. *Sed agúnt* is not admitted as a shortened anapaest in all the feet, but is excluded from the same places from which *redigúnt* is excluded, *i.e.* from the critical feet of iambic and trochaic verse, which commonly admit anapaestic and spondaic words only so far as they retain their normal prose accent. Ritschl (*Proleg.* pp. ccxxiii, ccxxxvi), with his wonderfully clear insight into all the problems of early Latin verse, has not failed to notice that Plautus commonly excluded these anapaestic groups from the critical feet of the dipodies. A fact of similar bearing is noted and correctly explained by Podiaski, *l.l.*, pp. 9 f., 55 f. In the seventh foot of the iambic octonarius and of the trochaic septenarius, in which the metrical law forbids the oxytonesis of iambic words, but admits that of anapaestic words, an iambic word when preceded by a short monosyllable is regarded as the equivalent of an anapaestic word;[2] hence, we have a legitimate verse-close in *Phorm.* 165:

Ita mé di béne ament, út mihi líceat tám diú *quod amó* fruí.

Cf. also Köhler, *De verb. acc. in troch. sept. Plaut.*, p. 30.

[1] Similarly, in the strict Ovidian treatment of the dactylic pentameter a close like 'reiciet *quid amans*,' *i.e.* quasi-trisyllabic close, is not admissible; cf. L. Müller, *Res. Metr.*, p. 248.

[2] The same is true, of course, of the fifth foot of the senarius. The explanation given by Luchs (*Studem. Stud.* I, p. 13) of this part of his metrical law is scarcely the true one, as I hope to show more fully elsewhere.

I have examined three plays, *i.e. Phormio, Hecyra, Adelphoe*, in order to determine how far the anapaestic groups observe the dipodic law in Terence. In the passage from the first to the second foot of the septenarius they are, of course, freely admitted (cf. Podiaski, *l.l.*, p. 73 f.), especially when they are preceded by a second coalescing monosyllable, as *Phorm.* 1040 hém[1] quid aís[2]; 200; 538. The following, also, are familiar cases of enclisis: *Hec.* 6 ob eám[4] rem; 584 ut apúd[2] me; 705 in ea[2] re; *Ad.* 590 quód quidem[4] erít, *i.e.* quódquidem[2] erít[6]. The three plays show the following exceptions to the dipodic law: *Phorm.* 777 tú, Geta, abí[4] prae; 951 quód modo erát; *Ad.* 617 emísse: id anús[4] mihi; 618 míssa, ubi eám[4]; 704 nam tibi eós[6]; cf. *Hec.* 172 Horunc. Ea ad hós[6] (doubtful reading). These five exceptions to the dipodic law[2], in the case of anapaestic groups, are scarcely more numerous than the exceptions admitted by Terence in the case of anapaestic words (see the dissertations of Brugman and Podiaski); it is noteworthy, also, that four of these cases are again preceded by monosyllables, and hence are excusable as quasi-choriambic words (cf. Ritschl, *Proleg.* ccxiii). On the other hand, anapaestic groups occur 55 times in the critical feet, with the normal accent *séd agunt*, and are admitted 40 times in the licensed feet, with the abnormal accent *sed agúnt*.

E. Quadrisyllabic Groups. — In trisyllabic groups we have seen that the three-syllable law was able, practically, to obliterate the pause after a short monosyllable, and to fix definitely the accent *séd ego*. The case is quite different with quadrisyllabic groups, such as *sed homines*, for the reason that, in the case of fourth paeon words, there exists only a strong tendency toward the recessive accent, but no absolute four-syllable law. In the case of quadrisyllabic groups, the slight pause after the monosyllable tended to check this recessive tendency. Nevertheless, Bücheler, *Umbrica*, p. 171, was probably correct in assuming that the Umbrian *neiđhabas, Ig.* IV, 33 (*i.e. neí ađhabas*), points to the existence

of the accent *né adeas* in early Latin. The examination of the accent of these groups in three plays of Terence (*Andr.*, *Eun.*, *Heaut.*) yields the following results. The predominance of the one accent or the other depends largely upon the kind of verse employed. In trochaic verse the accent on the fourth syllable is nearly twice as frequent as the accent on the third syllable, the ratio for the three plays being 23 : 13; in iambic verse the accent on the third syllable is nearly three times as frequent as the initial accent, the ratio being 77 : 27. Hence, since iambic verse greatly predominates in Terence, the accent on the third syllable is nearly twice as frequent as the initial accent in the three plays, taken as a whole, the combined ratio being 90 : 50. Hence, if we should look only at the combined ratio, we might, perhaps, conclude that *sed hómines* alone represents the grammatical accent. It is more probable, however, that *séd hominés* has been a genuine, though a less usual, pronunciation, and that the grammatical accent has vacillated, in the republican age, between the first two syllables. This may be shown from the following considerations: (1) The initial accent, as has already been mentioned, is actually twice as frequent in trochaic verse, which proves that it was by no means avoided. (2) Many single phrases show the initial accent predominant, also, in the combined ratio. Thus, *quíd agitur* occurs in Plautus and Terence 10 times (5 cases in iambic verse, 4 in trochaic, 1 in cretic: *Pers.* 17; 309; *Pseud.* 273; *Stich.* 528; 722; *Truc.* 860; *Phorm.* 610; *Ad.* 373; 883; 885); *quid ágitur* occurs 6 times (5 cases in iambic verse, 1 in trochaic: *Most.* 1076; *Pers.* 406; *Pseud.* 457; *Eun.* 271; 456; *Ad.* 901). Similarly the type *séd igitur* occurs in Terence 7 times (3 cases in iambic verse, 4 in trochaic: *Andr.* 375; 383; 519; 598; 749; *Eun.* 854; 966); the type *sed ígitur* occurs 5 times (all the cases being in iambic verse: *Andr.* 103; *Eun.* 46; *Heaut.* 818; *Phorm.* 924; *Ad.* 746). It is noteworthy that the recession is especially frequent in quadrisyllabic groups, such as *séd opus est*, *séd ego me*, etc., owing to the analogy of the simple *séd opus*, *séd ego*, etc.; cf. p. 82 f., above. (3) In proceleusmatic feet (iambic), which follow very closely

the grammatical accent, the accent on the third syllable is somewhat more usual, as *Hec.* 259 quam ego: *id ádeo;* but the initial accent is also found, as *Phorm.* 563 quid est *quód opera; Pers.* 480 homines *égo hodie; Curc.* 93 viden *út aperiuntur* (where *ut* is unnecessarily bracketed by Götz); *Asin.* 699; *Trin.* 846; *Truc.* 763; see Ahlberg, *Procel.* I, p. 131 ff.

It only remains to indicate those parts of the verse in which the initial accent chiefly occurs. In trochaic verse this accent is found occasionally in all the feet, but chiefly in the first and fifth, *i.e.* in the first foot of each colon; as, —

Andr. 335 : *Égo*[1] *id agám* mihi quí ne détur. ‖ *Sát*[5] *habeó* Davom óptumé.

In iambic verse the initial accent occurs chiefly in the third foot and immediately after the caesura of the senarius or octonarius (*e.g. Andr.* 413; 536; 883; cf. the frequent accent *fácilius* in the same position), in the fourth foot of the senarius (*e.g. Andr.* 89; 417; 749; 762) to aid in forming the well-known senarius-close, ⏑ | ⏑ ⏑ ∠ | ⏑ ∠ ‖, cf. Luchs, *Studem. Stud.* I, p. 13; Klotz, *Grundz.*, p. 243, and at the very close of the senarius or octonarius, cf. Klotz, *l.l.*, p. 280 (*e.g. Andr.* 311; *Eun.* 84; 854). The following examples illustrate these positions: —

Andr. 413 : Hodie óbserváre, ut *quid*[3] *agerét* de núptiis.

Ib. 749 : Satin sánus, quí me id rógites? ‖ Quem *égo*[4] *igitúr* rogém?

Ib. 311 : Video. Ómnia éxperíri cértumst príus quam péreo. ‖ *Quíd*[7] *hic agít?*

In the light of these results I wish to comment briefly on the theory of 'initial intensity,' which was first put forward as applicable to Latin words by L. Havet, *De Saturnio*, Paris, 1880, p. 26 ff. (cf. *Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique*, VI (1889), p. 13 f.), and has since found other adherents.[1] According to Havet an intensive pronunciation, *i.e.* a stress-accent, was associated with the initial syllable of Latin words. This 'initial intensity' is, however, quite different from the

[1] Cf. especially J. Vendryes, *Recherches sur l'histoire et les effets de l'intensité initiale en Latin*, Paris, 1902, and see the criticism of the theory by Solmsen in his review of this work, Wölfflin's *Archiv*, XIII, p. 137 f.

Latin accent described by the grammarians; for the latter, in Havet's judgment, was a musical accent and exerted no influence upon Latin prosody. Further, Havet recognizes this 'initial intensity' as belonging not only to words but also to groups, and he explains the shortening in *tibi ĭstum* as due to the initial intensity of the group: "(Les monosyllabes brefs) peuvent abréger la première syllable du mot suivant, parce qu'ils font jusqu'à un certain point corps avec lui" (Havet quoted by Plessis, *ed. Ad.*, p. 5). It is clear that so far as concerns the fact of intensive pronunciation in the first syllable of *tibi istum*, this explanation is identical with the one which I have offered, but when the question is asked whether the intensive pronunciation of the first syllable is due to the laws of the Latin accent, Havet holds that it bears no relation to these laws, but that the initial syllable is stressed *qua initialis*. Since then he admits the principle of word-groups in Latin pronunciation, the conclusion would seem to follow, if the theory of *initial* intensity be correct, that trisyllabic and quadrisyllabic groups[1] should be stressed on the first syllable with equal or nearly equal frequency. In practice we find, however, that these groups do not follow such a law of initial intensity, but that they obey rather the law according to which the Latin accent must recede three syllables and may (in words like *facilius*) recede four. Hence it appears that the accentuation of these groups cannot be explained by the theory of initial intensity, but only on the basis of the Latin accent-law.

VI. Ancient Testimonies.

A. Evidence of the Grammarians and Glosses. — It is not my purpose to review at length in this paper the testimonies of the Latin grammarians upon the accentuation of three-syllable groups nor to examine fully the evidence of the word-division in the inscriptions and Mss.; a brief treatment of these topics will be sufficient here. The Latin grammarians have

[1] The verse-form would not itself prevent this accentuation, as is shown by the regular accent *făcilius*.

nowhere had occasion to treat in a general or theoretical way the accent of such word-groups as we have examined; their lists, however, of the more frequent compound conjunctions not only furnish us with much valuable information on the general subject of accentual groups (*composita*), but include several examples of the present kind. Thus Priscian expressly informs us that the compound conjunctions *et enim*[1] (*etenim*) and *sed enim* (*sedenim*) have the initial accent: Keil, III, 93, 11 f. (= Schöll, *De acc.*, p. 192) Composita vero *átque étenim, sédenim.* Haec enim ex accentu composita esse noscuntur. Similarly *sedenim* is named as a *compositum* also in a gloss on Max. Vict., Keil, VI, 203, 12; *si enim, i.e.* probably *sĭenim*, is named as a *compositum* by Donatus, Keil, IV, 365, 2; *ibid.*, p. 389, 5, and by Cledonius, Keil, V, 24, 25; compare, also, the treatment of *quidistic* (in early Latin often *quidĭstic*) as a *compositum* by Priscian, Keil, III, 85, 33; *Corp. Gloss. Lat.* V, 622, 55 '*quidistic* sub uno accentu est profecto vel omnino.' There can be little doubt that the numerous other compounds of *enim* have a similar accent, *i.e. at enim, neque enim, quid enim, quod enim, id enim*, etc.

Among the glossarists Festus treats *neceunt* (= *non eunt*) and *necerim* (= *nec eum*) as single words (p. 162, 11 Müll.; Paul. *exc. Fest.*, p. 162, 21 Müll.), but the most complete evidence may be drawn from Götz and Gundermann's *Corpus Glossariorum Lat.* The conjunctions here glossed as compound words are *sede*[*c*]*cum*, II, 181, 19 (where the gloss ἔπιδε apparently indicates that the force of the simple conjunction is lost as completely as in the Italian *ebbene* (= *etbene*), 'very good'); *sedenim*, IV, 565, 52; *ut enim*, IV, 470, 45: *quidenim*, IV, 461, 1; *quidita*, II, 167, 14; IV, 158, 33, etc.; cf. *quidistic*, V, 622, 55; *quid igitur*, IV, 421, 16. In addition we find glosses upon the pronouns and verbs *atego* and *astego*,

[1] *Et enim* is nearly always written in our texts of Latin authors as one word; it is scarcely necessary to say that no such uniformity exists in the Mss., which no more write *et enim* than they write *ob viam* and *in vicem* invariably as one word. On account, however, of being much the most frequent of all the compounds of *enim, etenim* is usually written as one word, and this orthography is much more frequent than *sedenim, quidenim*, etc., which also occur.

II, 284, 34 (where, however, the Greek stands first); *et ego*, III, 342, 22 (where also the Greek stands first); *ide*[*g*]*o* (= ἐγὼ αὐτό[ν]), II, 80, 40; *numquid ego* (*i.e.* num quídego as a rule), = egone, IV, 369, 35; *idagis*, *idagit*, the latter = ἐνεργεῖ, II, 76, 12, 13; *quiamat*, II, 167, 5. The grammarians also name *quidita* among the compound adverbs (*quidita*, Audax, Keil, VII, 348, 14; *quid ita*, Dositheus, VII, 410, 24), and an abbreviation for the frequent phrase *ego enim* is found in the *Commentarii Not. Tironian.* It is instructive to compare also the traditional orthography in our texts of *etenim*, *potero*, *poteram*, *satago*, *retr*(*o*)*ago*, *retr*(*o*)*eo*, *veluti* (cf. *velut*, *nemut*), *adeo*, *ideo*, *postidea*, *ant*(*e*)*idea*, *ub*(*i*)*ubi*, *necuter*, *nĕuter* (according to some, cf. Lindsay, *Lat. Lang.*, p. 39), *necopinantem*, *etiam*, *quoniam*, etc., although it should be remembered that the separate writing *et enim*, *sat ago*, *vel uti*, *ubi ubi*, *nec opinantem* is also frequent in the Mss., and even the division *ad eo*, *id eo* is sometimes found.

B. Word-division in Inscriptions and Mss. — Finally, the word-division in the inscriptions and Mss. has an important bearing upon the question of the accent; for, from the time of Quintilian (I, 5, 25) the Roman grammarians often expressly connect the question of punctuation and word-division with the determination of the accent, often in the formula 'ratio distinguendi (dividendi) regulas accentuum corrumpit'; see the numerous passages of the grammarians on this subject, which are collected by Schöll, *l.l.*, p. 127 f. They also frequently recommend an unusual word-division, *i.e. hauscio* instead of *hau*(*d*) *scio* (Pseudo-Phocas, Keil, V, 441, 1), on the ground that it corresponds more fully to the accentuation. In the case of the Latin prepositions, both monosyllabic and dissyllabic, the omission of punctuation in writing is well known, but the similar usage by which the monosyllabic conjunctions, adverbs, and pronouns are joined in writing with the following word has received less attention, although it is by no means rare. Marius Victorinus, Keil, VI, 23, 7 ff., prescribes the omission of punctuation in *nechoc* and *necillud* just as in *ingalliam* and *initaliam:* sed ne ea quidem, quae cum praepositione dicuntur, circumpungetis, ut circumduci et cir-

cumveniri, et nonnulli et paulopost, nec haec, ut ingalliam, initaliam, nechoc, necillud, quae infinite dicuntur. In accordance with this orthography the monosyllables are at times written together with the following word in inscriptions of the best period, as may be seen from the examples collected by Corssen, who cites *Ausspr.* II[2], p. 868 *etcoronis*, *itauti*, *astu = ast tu* (often in the formula 'astu ea ita faxsis,' *Acta fratr. arv.*; cf. *attu* glossed as *tuvero*, *Corp. Gloss. Lat.*, IV, 22, 23), p. 877 *quodie* (very frequent, cf. also *CIL.* II, *suppl.*, *index*, p. 1181), *quivixit*, p. 879 *huncinerem*, p. 881 *nonlicebit*, *nondebuerunt*. This list might be greatly increased from inscriptions of the best character, and if examples are not to be found collected, like those involving the prepositions, in the various *Indices* of the *CIL.*, it is because the editors have often ascribed the absence of the division-points to carelessness or to exposure rather than to the true cause, viz. the Roman method of word-division. In the minuscule Mss. of the Carolingian period also, upon which the word-division of our texts chiefly rests, we find the monosyllabic particles and pronouns not seldom joined with the following word; cf. Wattenbach, *Lat. Palaeogr.*,[3] p. 76; Lindsay, *Lat. Text. Emendation*, p. 14. In carefully written Mss. of this period the traditional rules of word-division approved by the grammarians are commonly observed by the copyists, so that their usage is in substantial agreement with the inscriptions of the fourth and fifth centuries. It is scarcely necessary to add that the word-division of the minuscule Mss. is seldom strictly uniform in doubtful cases, and the uniformity which often appears in printed texts is due to the modern editor. Except in the case of obvious blunders, however, the word-division of the Mss. is clearly the authoritative division for critical purposes, and determines in each case what constitutes 'one part of speech' (*una pars orationis*).

In the case of the Terence Mss., as it happens, Umpfenbach has not included in his critical apparatus[1] variations in the word-division, but their usage is probably not very differ-

[1] On the general character of Umpfenbach's collation of the Terence Mss., see Minton Warren, *Am. Journ. Phil.* III, 59.

ent from that of the Palatine Mss. of Plautus, which afford examples on every page like *metarbitro* (*B*), *Cas.* 143, *sisim* 293, *nemihi* 341, etc. It is noticeable that Umpfenbach writes always *re fert*, *non dum*, *vel uti*, *quis nam* (on the basis of the frequent *nam quis*, *quis . . . nam*, cf. Hand, *Turs.* IV, 18 ff.), *inter est* (*Ad.* 393), *inter siet* (*Eun.* 685), *super est* (*Phorm.* 162), etc. These last examples are in accordance with the usage of many of the best official inscriptions (cf. Corssen, *Ausspr.* II^2, p. 853), and *superesse* at least is generally recognized as a separable compound (cf. L. Müller, *Res Metr.*, p. 264). Nowhere, in fact, is it more difficult to distinguish between the genuine and the separable Latin compounds[1] than in the case of many of the compound verbs; it is clear, however, from the evidence of Latin verse and the statements of the grammarians that these words were regularly accented as *composita*, *i.e. intér siet* (cf. *intér ibi*, *intér eos*, *proptér eos*), *supér erat*, *circúm dedit*, *anté venit*, etc.

One other question of Terentian orthography is valuable for the light which it throws upon the accentuation, viz. the assimilation which occurs at times in the *praepositiones adpositae* and which implies a closeness of connection equal to that existing in the case of the *praepositiones compositae*. Thus Umpfenbach (*praef.* xiv) points out that the *Bembinus* has *offactum*, *Heaut.* 956, for *ob factum*, *oppeccatum*, *ib.* 990, for *ob peccatum*, while *at te* occurs 8 times for *ad te;* for assimilation in other authors, see Neue-Wagener, *Formenl.* II, pp. 783; 905. Hence we cannot doubt that the secondary grammatical accent is fully observed in the following:

Caecil. *com. frgm.* 266 R.: Saépe est étiam *súp palliolo* sórdidó sapiéntiá.

It is evident from these facts, which might easily be illustrated by more numerous examples, that the Latin word-division is far from being fixed in a multitude of cases, and

[1] It should be remembered that many of the combinations which later came to be felt as genuine compounds were still separable compounds or word-groups in early Latin; cf. Ter. *Hec.* 364 *qua* me *propter* adduxi; 630 ne revereatur, *minus* iam *quo* redeat domum.

that those writers upon Latin accentuation who have treated the subject almost entirely in dependence upon the traditional word-division have chosen too narrow and too uncertain a basis for their study.

VII. Evidence of the Romance Languages.

The Romance languages have preserved in rich abundance the word-groups formed by the coalescence of monosyllabic words, *i.e.* Span. *tambíen* = *tambene*, Ital. *ebbéne* = *etbene*, *ossía* = *autsit*, *nemméno* = *necminus*, etc. (for the treatment of these phrases in Italian, see Meyer-Lübke, *Gramm. d. roman. Sprach.* I, p. 508), but the accent of these groups as a rule has been derived from the late period of vulgar Latin, when the processes of decomposition (recomposition) were applied to all the *composita* which were still recognized as such, *i.e. explícat* (Fr. esploie) instead of the classical *éxplicat*, *desúper* (Fr. desure) instead of the classical *désuper*, etc.; cf. Meyer-Lübke, *l.l.*, I, 495. Notwithstanding the great changes wrought in this period, the original accent has been retained in some cases. Thus, as Corssen, *Ausspr.* II², p. 889, and Skutsch, *Forsch.*, p. 158, have noticed, the Italian forms *colla*, *della*, *sulla* give evidence of the accent *cúm ĭlla*, *dĕ ĭlla*, *súb ĭlla*, just as we know from the Latin grammarians (see the passages quoted by Schöll, *De acc.*, p. 192 f.) that *dĕĭnde*, *pĕrĭnde*, etc., continued to be the usual colloquial pronunciation in contrast with the more formal *deínde*, *perínde*, etc. So also the relative pronoun *qui*, which was generally atonic in Latin, but of course became tonic in these groups, has both forms preserved in Spanish, *i.e.* the tonic form *quien* and the atonic *que* (cf. Seelmann, *Ausspr. d. lat.*, p. 57); for other possible cases, see Meyer-Lübke, *l.l.*, p. 504 ff. We may expect that additional cases of the preservation side by side of the tonic and the atonic forms of the Latin conjunctions and adverbs will be recognized when the problem of these double forms has been more fully worked out by Romance scholars than is the case at present.

VIII. Previous Investigators.

It remains to indicate how far students of early Latin verse have already advanced in the direction of the conclusions which have been reached in this article. The particular cases of trisyllabic groups in which uniform accentuation has already been noted are indeed very numerous. Thus the invariable accentuation of *quíd ita* has been pointed out by Luchs, *Hermes*, VIII, 114; of *quíd ego* in certain phrases by Kellerhoff, *Studem. Stud.* II, 55 (cf. also Seyffert, *Stud. Plaut.*, p. 9); of *át enim* by Seyffert, *Berl. Phil. Woch.* 1885, Sp., p. 40, and Ribbeck, *Com. Rom. Fragmenta*^{2}, p. xxxiv; of *quíd ais* by Conradt, *die Metr. Compos. d. Kom. d. Ter.*, p. 159; of *híc homo* by Luchs, *Comment. Pros.* I, p. 6 f.; of *quís homo, ís homo* by Nilsson, *Quomodo pronomina ap. Pl. et Ter. collocentur*, Lund, 1901, p. 61 (footnote). Several of these accentuations are also discussed by Skutsch, *Forsch.*, p. 154, and in his edition of the *Captivi*, which came into my hands after my own results had been reached, Lindsay adds *quí homo, tíbi ego dico* (pp. 367, 372). In the quadrisyllabic groups Bücheler, *Umbrica*, p. 171, has inferred the Plautine accentuation *nĕ adeas* from the Umbrian form *neiđhabas;* Hartmann, *K. Z.* XXVII, p. 558, has derived *igitur* as a weakened form from *quíd agitur.*

Finally, Ritschl, *Proleg.*, pp. cclviii–cclxi, has discussed this problem with his usual thoroughness and breadth of view. He does not limit his inquiry to the proclisis of the prepositions, but mentions also 'other similar combinations of words,' *i.e. quíd agis, quíd aïs, út opust, quód homo, quód edis*, etc., and from the analogy of these combinations he clearly derives the Plautine accentuation of *dé illo, ét iste, sét intus, quód omnes*, etc. (cf. *Proleg.*, p. cclxi: 'correptiones valde propinquae eadem prorsus ratione reguntur'). Hence in this, as in all other questions of Latin sentence-accentuation, Ritschl has sketched in brief but clear outlines the general conclusions which further study can only serve to strengthen. While the present study of syllable-shortening was at first

undertaken independently,[1] it will fulfil its purpose if it shall be instrumental in reviving Ritschl's solution of the problem and shall offer additional evidence in support of his conclusions.

[1] Unfortunately, a copy of the *Prolegomena* was not accessible to the writer during the first part of his work. The above reference to Ritschl must not be understood as meaning that he recognized in the *Proleg.* the *complete* recession of the early accent in *séd ea*, *séd agis*, *dd eum*, etc.